

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION SIX

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

ELIZABETH KAY RAY,

Defendant and Appellant.

2d Crim. No. B293843
(Super. Ct. No. 18F-07303)
(San Luis Obispo County)

Elizabeth Kay Ray appeals a judgment of conviction entered after she expressly waived her constitutional rights and pleaded nolo contendere to two counts of caretaker theft from an elderly or dependent adult. (Pen. Code, § 368, subs. (d) & (e).)¹ The trial court sentenced Ray to a four-year sentence in county jail, split between 18 months in custody and two and one-half years on mandatory supervision for count 1. (§ 1170, subd. (h)(5)(B).) The court imposed but stayed a concurrent 180-day sentence for count 2. (§ 654.) The court also imposed various

¹ All further statutory references are to the Penal Code.

fines and fees, ordered terms and conditions of mandatory supervision, and awarded Ray 209 days of presentence custody credit.

According to the probation report, Ray was employed as a caretaker of A.F. and J.M., elderly women with cognitive impairment. Ray fraudulently used credit cards belonging to the elderly women and physically abused A.F. When arrested, Ray was under the influence of a controlled substance. A search of Ray's property yielded methamphetamine, a handgun, and the wallets, credit cards, and wills belonging to the elderly women.

Ray thereafter appealed, purporting to appeal discovery violations. The trial court denied Ray a certificate of probable cause.

We appointed counsel to represent Ray in this appeal. After counsel's examination of the record, he filed an opening brief raising no issues.

On March 4, 2019, we advised Ray by mail that she had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or issues that she wished to raise on appeal. We have not received a response. The letter was returned undeliverable.

We have reviewed the entire record and are satisfied that Ray's attorney has fully complied with his responsibilities and that no arguable issue exists. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441.)

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

GILBERT, P.J.

We concur:

YEGAN, J.

TANGEMAN, J.

Jacquelyn H. Duffy, Judge

Superior Court County of San Luis Obispo

Richard B. Lennon, under appointment by the Court of
Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.